

Application No. 09/997,368
Amendment "A" dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 31, 2001

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies that were extended during the recent in person interview held on July 19, 2005. The amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The First Office Action mailed February 23, 2005, considered claims 1-34.¹ Claims 9-14 and 21-28 were withdrawn from further consideration as per the Response to Restriction Requirement, filed March 14, 2005. In the Office Action dated May 31, 2005, claims 1-8 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,708,205 (Sheldon et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,085 (Smith)²

By this paper, claims 1-8 and 15-20 have been amended; claim 9-14, 16 and 21-34 have been cancelled³; and new claims 34-38 have been added. Claims 1-8, 15, 17-20 and 35-38 remain pending. Claim 1 is the only remaining independent method claim at issue, with claim 15 being directed to a corresponding computer program product claim for implementing the method of claim 1.

As discussed during the interview, the present invention is directed to embodiments for coordinating notifications to a user that are generated by one or more entities involved in a transaction. Claim 1, for instance, recites a method in which notifications are delivered to a user from multiple entities involved in a transaction. As further recited, a notification interface is provided such that the multiple entities are enabled to send the notifications to the notification interface, which in turn delivers the notifications to a router. The router then, upon determining

¹ The Office Action dated Feb. 23, 2005 incorrectly stated that claims 1-38 were pending and were subject to restriction. Furthermore, the Office Action dated May 31, 2005, incorrectly states that claims 1-28 are pending and that 9-14 and 21-28 were withdrawn. It is our belief that up to this response, claims 1-34 are pending and that 9-14 and 21-34 were withdrawn.

² Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last response, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

³ Claims 9-14 and 21-34 were previously withdrawn without traverse in the response dated Mar. 14, 2005, to the Office Action dated Feb. 23, 2005. The Office Action dated May 31, 2005, appears to have incorrectly stated that claims 1-28 are pending and that 9-14 and 21-28 were withdrawn.

Application No. 09/997,368
Amendment "A" dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 31, 2001

how to deliver the notifications to the user, delivers the notifications. It will be appreciated that through the foregoing method, and other claimed embodiments, the one or more notifications corresponding to the particular transaction are ultimately delivered to the user in a coordinated manner.

As further clarified during the interview, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest a method or system as recited in the pending claims. Instead, Sheldon is generally directed towards an email system which allows for a user to have multiple directories into which email messages are placed according to the suffix appended to the users email address.

The methods recited in Sheldon fail to disclose or suggest any method, as recited in the claims, wherein a notification interface is provided to receive the multiple notifications from the multiple entities involved in a particular transaction. Sheldon also clearly fails to disclose such a method or system wherein a router determines how to deliver the notifications to the user.

The only other cited art, Smith, also fails to compensate for the failings of Sheldon. In particular, as discussed in the interview, Smith merely discloses a wireless modem and method for routing data to an application or storage. In this regard, Applicants acknowledge that wireless data routers are commonly known to those skilled in the art. The router taught by the Applicants' invention, however, is distinguished inasmuch as it determines how notifications corresponding to a transaction and that are received from a plurality of corresponding entities may be delivered to a user in a coordinated manner.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the rejections of record are now moot, such that it is not necessary to address each of the other assertions of record in the last response. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of said assertions in the future. Accordingly, although the foregoing remarks are primarily directed to the independent claims, it will be appreciated that the dependent claims should also be found allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is not necessary to individually address the rejections to each of the dependent claims at this time. Nevertheless, a few of the dependent claims will be addressed by the following remarks, as discussed during the interview, to even further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.


Application No. 09/997,368
Amendment "A" dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 31, 2001

New claims 35-38, for example, recite embodiments that clarify how the notifications received at the notification interface include a plurality of notifications received from different entities (claim 35), how the notifications are standardized prior to being sent to the user (claim 36), how at least one of the multiple entities passes an identifier to another entity and prior to the other entity sending a notification to the notification interface (claim 37), and wherein the router determines which of a plurality of user devices to send the notifications to. These additional claim embodiments further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art of record.⁴

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims 1-8, 15, 17-20 and 35-38 are in condition for prompt allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 2 day of Aug, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:ppa

⁴ Support for the newly added claims may be found in the specification within the original application, including, but not limited to paragraphs 36-37, 42 and 59.